



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/938,229	08/23/2001	Hiram M. Samel	M1003/7002 MBL	1859

23628 7590 03/14/2003

WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS, PC
FEDERAL RESERVE PLAZA
600 ATLANTIC AVENUE
BOSTON, MA 02210-2211

EXAMINER

GUARRIELLO, JOHN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1771

3

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/938229

Applicant(s)

Same1

Examiner

John Guarriello

Group Art Unit

1721

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement

Application Papers

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d).
 - ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). #2
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1771

DETAILED ACTION

15. Per telephone conversation of 3/3/2003 with Aaron W. Moore, the Oral election of two groups of claims has been withdrawn. All claims will be examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

16. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office

action: A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-6, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Bray 280,286.

Bray describes describes a textile material made of paper strands or threads which may be made by any known method of weaving or knitting, (column 1, lines 27-31). Bray describes the textile material having a fine weave (corresponding to the tightly woven limitation of the claimed invention), (column 1, lines 24-25). Bray describes the warp and weft can be

Art Unit: 1771

made from very narrow, spun or twisted strands of yarn as desired, (column 1, lines 49-50; column 2, lines 51-55). Bray describes carpets, corresponding to rugs or matting for covering floors, (column 1, lines 9-11). Bray describes the method steps as paper yarns as woven by well known methods in weaving, (column 1, lines 20-32). It is the Examiner's position that Bray describes the essential limitations of the claimed invention. Claims lack novelty.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claims 1-3, 7, 8, 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bray 280,286.

Bray as in paragraph # 17 above with the difference being that Bray is silent about the density of the set of yarns. Regarding the method steps, Bray

Art Unit: 1771

describes the paper yarns woven by any well known methods in weaving, (column 1, lines 24-32). Bray describes tightly twisted strands or threads which is closely woven (corresponding to tightly woven in the claimed invention), (column 1, line 45-56). Regarding the cutting step it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to cut the woven the woven yarns to form rugs because this involves routine skill in the art, see *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70, and this would be a conventional step in the formation of a rug so as to fit different floor dimensions of apartments, see column 2, lines 60-64.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the density of the set of yarns motivated with the expectation that with yarns or threads closely woven the fabric or textile can be washed without liability of injury or damage, (column 1, lines 44-50).

Double Patenting

Art Unit: 1771

19. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Art Unit: 1771

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

20. Claim 9 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-50 of U.S. Patent No. 6,506,697. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply a backing (corresponding to a polymeric material) as evidenced by Patton 5,082,697, (column 3, lines 50-54; column 4, lines 18-30; column 7, lines 45-53).

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John J. Guarriello whose telephone

Art Unit: 1771

number is 703-308-3209. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8 am to 4 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris, can be reached on (703) 308-2414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-5408.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



John J. Guarriello:gj

Patent Examiner

March 3, 2003

March 7, 2003.



TERREL MORRIS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700